

October 7, 1965

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300140011-2
CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A5637

"DEAR SIR: It is a pleasure to let you know we appreciate you being our Congressman, and all the things you are doing for us. I am taking training at Jackson, Ohio, at the manpower training center. It is a wonderful opportunity for people who aren't qualified for a job. We have good instructors. We are grateful to all of you that helped get the training started.

"Yours truly,

"ROBIE SLUSHER."

This letter eventually reached the desk of the President of the United States. President Johnson said the letter "gave him a heartwarming insight into the value of the manpower training program."

Robie was proud of his letter to the Congressman. He was proud to be able to write to his family. He was proud to be able to help his smaller children.

A new world was opening for Robie Slusher. He continued his studies and his training at the manpower training center. But it ended this past weekend for Robie. He died of a heart attack at his home to the shock of his family and friends and fellow students and instructors at the manpower training center.

But we don't think Robie's training was in vain. And Robie was but one of many students in the basic education classes at the manpower center who are showing tremendous progress.

Robie's instructor Art Jenkins and the training center director Clarence Gingerich report almost unbelievable progress in this area and other areas of the training program. "It is fantastic in many cases to see the development and growth of the individuals," says Director Gingerich.

Robie Slusher, a man coming out of a shell, will be mourned. But the program he was part of will go on.

What Is at Stake in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT N. C. NIX

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. NIX. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor recently carried an editorial which I believe is the clearest and most compelling argument for President Johnson's policies in Vietnam that has been published to date. With typical restraint, but with incisive logic—and the facts to back it up—the Monitor has, in my opinion, completely demolished all the arguments that have been used against our involvement in that war-torn country. The editorial acknowledges the criticism of our policy, but concludes:

We believe the first signs are now coming from that troubled and unhappy land that the policy was right, even though the end desired may still be far away. A change in mood is reported from Saigon. And the United States seems to be making the point that was so needed—that it simply cannot and will not be ejected from South Vietnam by force.

I hope all of my colleagues will read this excellent editorial:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Sept. 25, 1965]

WHAT IS AT STAKE IN VIETNAM

Ambassador Arthur Goldberg told the United Nations General Assembly, Thurs-

day, that the Chinese Communists were trying "to transfer the country of South Vietnam into a proving ground for their theories." Their theories, in effect, are that "people's revolutionary wars"—in other words, wars that are likely to bring to power Communists tributary to Peking—are just, must be supported, and will end in victory for the revolutionaries.

Chinese Defense Minister Lin Biao wrote the other day: "The spiritual atom bomb that the revolutionary people possess is a far more powerful and useful weapon than the physical atom bomb."

This statement of Marshal Lin's appeared in the manifesto on which Ambassador Goldberg commented with such vigor in his United Nations speech. In the manifesto, too, was a sentence which—placed alongside Mr. Goldberg's words quoted above—points up the confrontation and the incompatible positions in Vietnam. "The United States," the marshal wrote, "has made South Vietnam a testing ground for the suppression of people's war."

Such phrases of doubletalk have been made familiar in this age by the Communists, but the basic situation is age old. The conflict in Vietnam results from a collision on the frontier between the legitimate areas of power of two giants.

The United States—the only one of the three actual or potential superpowers that is an air and sea power rather than a land power—is legitimately concerned with what happens, not only along its own coastline, but on the far shores of the two oceans that bound it. For an air or sea power, the opposite shore is always a possible launching pad for air or sea attacks. (In the old days, that is why Britain always reacted when it saw a threat on the far side of the English Channel.)

Thus the United States has a justifiable interest in what happens along the Pacific coast of Asia. This explains and validates its present commitments in Japan, in South Korea, in the Philippines—and in South Vietnam.

Looking outward from the Asian heartland, the Chinese Communists see this same rim of Asia as the frontier of their power. And so they find themselves in collision with the United States. Under normally civilized conditions, a *modus vivendi* surely could be found—as the United States and the Soviet Union eventually found one at a point where they were in collision in Europe. This was in Austria. But an Austrian settlement would never have come about, had the Soviets committed themselves to ousting the Americans from the country by force—as the Chinese, subtly and indirectly, have committed themselves to ousting the Americans from Vietnam.

There has been this year sharp criticism from some quarters within the free world of President Johnson's policy of escalation in Vietnam. We believe the first signs are now coming from that troubled and unhappy land that the policy was right, even though the end desired may still be far away. A change in mood is reported from Saigon. And the United States seems to be making the point that was so needed—that it simply cannot and will not be ejected from South Vietnam by force.

There is repeated evidence from President Johnson himself—and most recently in Ambassador Goldberg's speech—that the U.S. purpose in Vietnam is indeed not war but peace and tranquillity for all Asia. We believe in the sincerity of the administration's invitation to the United Nations to help find a way to peace. And, generally speaking, the path chosen by the administration this year is the one most likely to produce the right kind of peace.

The Immigration Act—A Milestone in International Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, this Nation passed an historic milestone in its international relations on October 3 when President Johnson signed the new immigration bill abolishing the national origins quota system.

For 40 years we have suffered a stain to remain on our statute books and on the beautiful lady on Liberty Island who watches over our New York gateway and in whose shadow the President signed this historic bill.

Beginning in 1924, we proclaimed to the world that a person's contribution to our national well-being, and his right to join our national community, was to be judged in large part by the place of his birth or the country of his ancestors. This theme, so repugnant to our ideas of the equality of man, has haunted us at home and abroad for four decades.

By the act of October 3 we shall no longer be concerned with a man's birthplace or ancestry but he will be judged on two factors only: His relationship to citizens or aliens already here and the skills and talents he may bring with him, the better to help us in forging our national society.

No one should fear these changes. More importantly, no fears should be entertained that we are substantially increasing our immigration; relaxing our standards of admission; or prejudicing the jobs we hold. The bill authorizes a purely nominal increase in total immigration. It does not change any of the grounds of inadmissibility or deportability.

The new law does not prohibit the entry of aliens who do not have the relationship or the skills which result in a preferential treatment. It does not permit such an immigrant to come here, but only after preference classes have been taken care of and only if the Secretary of Labor has determined that his admission to this country will not undermine the wages and working conditions of the employed American.

No longer, however, will the immigrant without family ties or outstanding talent be able to migrate here immediately because he was born in northern or western Europe, while a U.S. citizen waits for years before his aged parents from southern or eastern Europe can obtain a quota number.

No longer will the scientist from southern Asia be kept from joining the staff of an American university because only 100 persons may be allowed to enter this country annually from his native land.

No longer will the refugee from communism's tyranny and oppression be stigmatized by being "paroled" into the

October 7, 1965

A5638

United States, a term too closely associated with the status of the released criminal. For the first time in our immigration experience, a specific authorization for the orderly entry of 10,700 such refugees annually has been incorporated into our basic law.

The new law is not a general revision of the patchwork quilt of sometimes obscure and sometimes contradictory legislation on immigration which occupies over 175 pages of our statute books. It is, however, a clear-cut repudiation of the fallacious and demeaning philosophy which constituted the national origins quota system. In the best sense of the term it is a selfish law. While its provisions give greater hope to those outside our gates, in the elimination of this 20th century shibboleth the greatest beneficiaries of the law are the American people.

I am proud to have been a sponsor of this legislation and to have been present at the historic ceremonies on Liberty Island when our President signed the immigration bill and reaffirmed our national policy.

Art in Iowa Besmirched

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN A. RACE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, Gazette is deeply concerned that Members of this body, and Americans all over this country, may have gotten the impression that Iowans are not concerned about arts and humanities.

As a gesture of friendliness to my neighbor State of Iowa, and lest some Members actually believe Iowans do not care for art, I include as part of my remarks the Gazette editorial of October 2, 1965, "Art in Iowa Besmirched":

ART IN IOWA BESMIRCHED

When the U.S. House of Representatives this month approved a bill to subsidize the arts and humanities with grants of \$21 million for each of 3 years, Iowa's Representative H. R. Gross made nationwide news in his effort to beat the bill by ridicule.

We are not convinced that Federal aid to artists, performers and scholars will be altogether good for them or for the country, but we do see regrettable flaws in derision as a weapon of attack.

Representative Gross misreads the attitude of many Iowans and does no service to the State in spreading an impression that Iowans belittle the arts or consider them silly and subject to scorn. His opposition in the House had that effect through several deadpan Gross amendments, all rejected.

One proposed that belly-dancing be included in the arts definition. Another would have added to it "baseball, football, golf, tennis, squash, pinochle and poker." Another suggested direct arts aid to Appalachia and the "poverty-stricken areas of New York and New Jersey."

With this approach, Representative Gross perpetuated tactics used for years by a self-styled "boob bloc" of congressional wits in their generally successful move to laugh arts

bills off the floor. This time he alone led the snicker assault. It fell extremely flat. The arts-and-humanities subsidy bill won overwhelming passage, and more bills like it doubtless will appear in years ahead.

When it comes to Iowa's involvement in the arts, a far more fitting theme for national exposure would stress what Iowa has done in arts promotion fund-raising efforts for a million-dollar art gallery project on the University of Iowa campus are nearing success. Cedar Rapids is completing a campaign for \$250,000 in contributions to remodel its art center building. Des Moines has an art center known and respected throughout the State. So does Davenport. So does Marshalltown. So do several other Iowa communities whose interest mirrors that of countless Iowans in tune with cultural enrichment progress everywhere.

To contradict this with misleading, stale comedy in Congress paints a picture both phony and harmful. The oldtime boob-bloc image was deserved and apropos, perhaps, but now it belongs to a bygone day that no true spokesman for the State should wrongly advertise.

Education's Keys to Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 7, 1965

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, Francis Keppel this week delivered a significant address on the subject of the role of the Federal Government in American education.

He appeared before a seminar of the Educational Writers Association, meeting at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington, Tuesday, October 5.

One of the reoccurring themes we hear so often, from some quarters, is that with the increasing Federal participation in the Nation's educational processes, there will follow Federal control and eventual domination, as surely as night follows day.

Commissioner Keppel does not believe that this is true, nor has to be the case. Neither do I. I think the Commissioner has successfully harpooned this argument. In his outstanding talk, he points out that the Federal Government, in reality, is a "junior partner," with the States and local governments, in American education.

Mr. Keppel correctly emphasizes that the Federal Government has had a vital interest in American education extending back virtually to the start of this Nation. He points out that today American education is not controlled in Washington, but in the State capitals, the local school districts, and the classrooms of this country. Support for education in the United States is predominantly in the hands of State and local governments. Even with the sharp increase in Federal contributions to our education processes in the past several years, notably through outstanding educational programs of the 88th Congress, "the education Congress" and the present session of the 89th Congress, the Federal Government invests less than 8 percent of

its gross funds for all educational purposes, while the States allocate about 35 percent of their gross funds to the schools, while local governments invest 45 percent.

In his talk before the Education Writers Tuesday, Commissioner Keppel pointed out that the Governors and educators attending the recent Interstate Compact for Education conference in Kansas City, Mo., acknowledged the increasing need for Federal financial help to the Nation's school systems. On the other hand, they also urged stronger leadership in this area on the part of the States and local governments. In this, Commissioner Keppel agrees. And so do I. And, I feel sure, so do the great majority of the Members of the Congress.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 spells this out. As Commissioner Keppel points out:

Title V of the act is directed to help strengthen our State departments of education, the pivotal agencies on which we must depend if we mean to keep American education both strong and decentralized.

I firmly believe that the continued effectiveness of the Federal-State-local partnership in the field of education, as well as in many others, will depend to a great degree upon the kind of leadership exercised by the States and local education agencies. I believe it will be strong and vigorous.

I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to Commissioner Keppel upon his additional, new title, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Education.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Commissioner Keppel's remarks at this point:

EDUCATION'S KEYS TO SUCCESS

(An address by Francis Keppel, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, before a seminar of the Education Writers Association, Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C., October 5, 1965)

It is good to be here with you today, to resume our continuing discourse on what's new in American education.

Washington clearly has provided education news in abundance this year. It will doubtless continue to do so.

The President feels strongly about the urgency of strengthening education. So does the Congress. So, it is clear, do the American people.

And yet I think that all of us here in Washington look toward the day when the most dramatic news about American education will be developing beyond this capital city—across the country in our State capitals and, particularly, in the educational agencies established by our States to administer our education structure.

During the 88th and now the 89th Congress, we have seen the greatest array of education acts in the Nation's history—acts that establish a vigorous and effective relationship among local, State, and Federal activities for improving education at all levels. Recognizing that the strength of our schools and colleges and universities has become an overriding national concern, our elected representatives have called for strong national participation and national support, in partnership with the States and local communities.

For the Federal Government to participate in education—to be a partner, a junior partner, with the States and local communi-